

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ÇONFIRMATION NO.	
10/648,170	08/26/2003	Jason B. Chesser	42.P11893D	4447	
7590 09/10/2007 R. Alan Burnett BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard			EXAM	EXAMINER .	
			PATEL,	PATEL, NIHIR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026 .		3772			
				•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/10/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/648,170	CHESSER ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Nihir Patel	3772			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHO WHIC - Exten after S - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DASIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply within the	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this communication. NED; (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status			•			
2a) <u></u> 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08.26</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, p				
Disposition of Claims						
5)□ 6)□ 7)□ 8)⊠ Applicatio	Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application. (a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) 1-31 are subject to restriction and/or expenses The specification is objected to by the Examine of the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access	vn from consideration. election requirement.	e Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the objection to the objected to by the Explacement declaration is objected to by the Explacement declaration is objected to by the Explacement of the explanation is objected to by the Explanation is objected to be applied to the explanation of the objection to th	on is required if the drawing(s) is	objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice 3) Inform	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Date			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-14, drawn to a capillary pump loop cooling system, classified in class
 subclass 104.33.
- II. Claims 15-26, drawn to condenser, classified in class 165, subclass 122.
- III. Claims 27-31, drawn to evaporator, classified in class 165, subclass 104.26. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed. The subcombination has separate utility such as a single coil of tubing.

Inventions I and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed. The subcombination has separate utility such as a base and a top cover.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found

Application/Control Number: 10/648,170 Page 3

Art Unit: 3772

allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

If the applicant elects invention II (condenser), the applicant must further elect one of the following species:

Species I: Figure(s) 2A, 2B and 2C

Species II: Figure(s) 3 A and 3B

If the applicant elects invention III (evaporator) the applicant must further elect one of the following species:

Species I: Figure(s) 4A, 4B, 4C and 4D

Species II: Figure(s) 6A and 6B

Species III: Figure(s) 7A and 7B

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In

either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nihir Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4803. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 to 4:30 every other Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Bianco can be reached on (571) 272-4940. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit 3772

Wilia Partes

Nihir Patel

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700